MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

DR. UZAWA: Mr. President, with the Court's permission I should like to introduce to this Tribunal Mr. Hyoichiro KUSANO, counsel for the defendant SATO, Kenryo.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, when the Tribunal adjourned yesterday afternoon I was making some reference to the wartime changes from government administration, and, in particular, I was referring at that time to the changes which have been brought about by reason of the creation of the Ministry of Munitions. I was going on to say that the Cabinet Planning Board and the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, which I have previously mentioned, were abolished, and their duties with respect to manufacturing and armament production were transferred to the new Munitions Ministry.

The new Ministry likewise was responsible for the functions formerly carried out by the Control Associations.

In short, the purpose of the Munitions
Ministry was to give military leaders of the Government direct control over all activities of industry

in order that there might be an increase in the production of war materials.

1.1

The New Transportation and Communications
Ministry was formed, and it was stated that the intention of the Government in creating the new Ministry
was to co-ordinate the whole transport system by sea
and by land in Japan, Manchukuo and occupied China
under a single authority. All types of communications,
including mail, telephone and wireless services, were
placed under the control of the new Ministry.

There was also created the New Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce. It was the intention of the Government to delegate all remaining functions of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, after all other activities had been taken over by the Ministry of Munitions, to the newly created Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce. In addition, the new Ministry obtained a wide jurisdiction over agricultural activities, special emphasis being placed upon the supply of food and consumer's goods.

The Supreme Council for the Direction of War was created in August 1944. Its purpose as announced by the Japanese Government was to formulate a fundamental policy for direction of the war.

Mention has already been made of the Board

of Fleet Admirals and Field Marshalls and the Supreme War Council both of which were advisory bodies to the Emperor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Other agencies which should be mentioned in this connection are the Army and Navy General Staff who are charged with the duty of advancing a programme for national defence and military operations. In matters of national defence their decisions were reported directly to the Emperor during peacetime, and in time of war they are reported to Imperial Headquarters. When the problems were of sufficient importance they were brought before the Board of Fleet Admirals and Field Marshalls or to the Supreme War Council or to both. After Imperial sanction had been given, the matters were referred to the War Minister or to the Navy Minister for execution. However, on any matters pertaining to the actual operation of the armed forces on the fighting fronts, the General Staffs assume complete responsibility.

Following the China Incident the military brought about the creation of a Liaison Committee to establish a basic policy for directing the war by co-ordinating the civilian and military branches of the Government. Its membership consisted of the

War Minister, Navy Minister, Chief of the Army General Staff, Chief of the Navy General Staff, and, as a Committee, it stood between the Imperial Headquarters and the Government.

.0

For almost seven years the members of the Liaison Committee accomplished their tasks fairly well but when the Japanese Army and Navy began to suffer reverses a still closer tie was found to be necessary.

In February of 1944, steps were taken to combine under a single head the Army and Navy Ministers and the Chiefs of the Army and Navy Staffs. The purpose of this move was to strengthen and coordinate the existing functions of the Liaison Committee. Because of strong opposition within high governmental and military circles to this innovation and for other reasons, the Government fell.

The succeeding Government separated the military from the administrative and set up this new body called "The Supreme Council for the Direction of War". As a result of this reorganization, the Liaison Committee was abandoned largely because it did not have enough power and was unable to iron out the differences of opinion in high governmental circles, particularly upon the question of industri-

al production.

The new Supreme Council was an effort to unify the supreme command and national affairs after the basic administrative and military policies had been formulated. Its task was one of integration with particular reference to military operations and production.

The new Supreme Council was responsible for decisions relating to the basic plans for the execution of the war and the all-important aircraft and other war production. The basic policies decided by the Council were carried out by the Imperial Head-quarters and the Government. The relations between the new Council and the Government were not based on legislating but rather on political considerations. In other words the Cabinet was not bound legally by the decisions of the new Council, but from a political standpoint, as a matter of course, it was governed by the decisions of the Council.

During the war there was, of course, as in other countries, a great deal of wartime legislation. It will be sufficient, I think, to mention only a few of the more important enactments. There was the National Mobilization Law, originally promulgated in 1938, and revised in 1941. It is the foundation of

almost all wartime laws. It is to be found in Exhibit 84 in the case, and Exhibit 99 in the case is a list of Imperial Ordinances enacted under the provisions of the National Mobilization Law.

Then there was the New Peace Preservation

Law, which is to be found in Exhibit 98 in the case.

This law, enacted in 1941, provides heavy penalties

for persons who organize associations the object of

which is to change the national policy, or who insti
gate sedition.

Mr. Wakatsuki, the Home Minister, said in introducing the bill,

"It aims at prohibiting such illegal societies as are subversive of the fundamental principles underlying the national organization."

It is not my purpose to say more than a word about the Government of the Japanese occupied territories.

When the Greater East Asia Ministry was created in 1942, it absorbed the Bureau of the former Overseas Ministry which had originally administered the territories of the Mandated Islands (i.e. the Carolines, Marshalls and the Marianas), the Kwantung Leased Territory and the occupied areas in China and the Scuth Pacific.

In Manchukuo, although the Manchukuoan Government bore the cutward signs of an independent organization, it will be shown in evidence in this case, it was in practice controlled by the Japanese occupying forces.

Its constitution and government organization resembled that of Japan in almost every respect. Its Legislative Council did not meet once
in its supposed existence, and all legislation has
been enacted by a State Council headed by the Premier,
who was appointed by the Emperor. It will also be
shown that the actual ruler of Manchukuo was the
Commander-in-Chief of the Japanese Kwantung Army,
who also served as Japanese Ambassador to Manchukuo.

In occupied China the Governments are three in number: The National Government of China at Nan-king; the Mongolian Government; and there were Special Administrative areas along the south coast of China.

The National Government of China at Nanking, it will be shown in evidence, was a puppet state. This Government claimed control over all of China, but its actual existence depended upon the support of the Japanese occupying armies, Structurally, the Government was complete, having Assemblies, Ministries, Provincial Districts, Governors and Magistrates.

Opposed to the Nanking regime stood the Government of Republican China, led by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek from his capital at Chungking. In the north west, the Chinese Communists, while steadfast in their opposition to the expansion of the Japanese, have never worked in harmony with the Chungking regime.

It will be shown that the Federated Mon-

It will be shown that the Federated Mongolian Autonomous Government was actually under the control of the Japanese Kwantung Army.

In the course of this explanation I have had occasion to mention the Imperial Rule Assistance
Association.

In Japan, political parties were largely built around the personality and influence of individual leaders rather than around meaningful principles and party platforms.

Two of the most prominent political parties, as will be shown, were probably successful because each was backed by the economic interests of a power-ful Japanese family corporation.

In October 1940, Prince Konoye demanded as a condition of his acceptance of office the voluntary dissolution of all political parties.

A National political agency, the Imperial

Rule Assistance Association, was organized and replaced or absorbed all political parties and assumed their functions.

It is a government-controlled propaganda agency andracted in economic as well as political matters on both national and local levels.

.

The Prime Minister was President of the Imperial Rule Assistance Association, but much of the actual direction is in the hands of the Vice-Fresident -- usually a cabinet minister without portfolio. The Premier appoints all high-ranking officials.

This organization was only a qualified success. In the election of April, 1942, it won only eithty-one percent of the seats in the House of Representatives, and in Lay, 1942, an additional body -- the Imperial Rule Assistance Folitical Society -- was set up to function in the political sphere and to secure a more complete control over elections.

In conclusion, may I say this, Mr. President and Nembers, it is not the purpose of this explanation to attempt to point to defects in the Japanese system of government for the purpose of demonstrating that it has proved to be unsuited to the development of peaceful practices and policies. But it is submitted that this phase of the subject may be summed up by stating that it is apparent that there is in Japan an absence of an effective system of responsibility of Government to the people.

with the dual purpose, on the one hand, of stilling popular clamor for representative institutions and on the other, perpetuating and fortifying the centralized and autocratic governmental structure which its framers, the Neiji leaders believed necessary for the continued existence and development of Japan in the modern world. Consistent with this latter purpose, power was retained in the hands of a small group of personal advisers around the Throne, and the elected representatives of the people were given only limited supervisory powers

over legislation.

When a Cabinet falls, the new Frime Minister, who selects his own Cabinet, is appointed not automatically as the leader of the majority party in the House of Representatives, but by the Emperor after taking advice. The nature and composition of a new government consequently is determined by this advice, rather than by the majority view in the lower house.

It has been pointed out that the power of the Diet to control government expenditures is greatly restricted by the provisions in the Constitution that if a budget is rejected by the Diet,

that of the preceding year automatically goes into effect, and also, by the magnitude of the excepted items in the budget itself. If to these items is added the continuing appropriations, a small amount of the expenditure is left for the consideration of the Diet.

Although the passing of general laws pertaining to the internal affairs of the nation are within its province, in practice, most bills are introduced by members of the Cabinet, in whose selection the Diet has no part.

The powers to declare war, make peace and conclude treaties are Imperial prerogatives over which the Diet can exert only an indirect influence because of its inability to control the Cabinet and the Frivy Council which, together with other advisers close to the Throne, advise the Emperor upon these matters.

The Diet has no power over dynastic affairs, it cannot initiate amendments to the Constitution, it cannot convene of its own accord, and it may be prorogued for a period up to fifteen days any number of times during a session by the Emperor on the advice of the Frime Minister.

It has also become apparent that inasmuch

as approximately one-half of the House of Peers is composed of the nobility, one fourth of persons elected by and from the highest tax-payers and one fourth of Imperial appointees, its equal legislative power with the popularly elected lower house gives representatives of the propertied and conservative classes in Japan an undue influence on legislation.

The Privy Council, composed of a president, a vice-president, and twenty-four councillors appointed for life and the members of the Cabinet ex officio, serves as the supreme advisory body to the Emperor. The Ordinance defining its power, promulgated in 1890, stipulated that, generally speaking, its advice was to be solicited by the Emperor only on constitutional questions, international treaties and agreements, and prior to the issuance of emergency Imperial Ordinances.

Gradually, however, the Council has extended its activities and increased its power until in recent decades it has come to resemble a "Third Chamber" with broad supervisory powers over the executive in both foreign and domestic matters. It has frequently opposed the Cabinet on policy questions and on several occasions has

forced the downfall of Cabinets possessing the confidence of the Diet. Owing no political responsibility to the Diet or to the people for its activities, and yet exerting important influences over the entire affairs of the State, the Privy Council has proved an important barrier to the development of a sound parliamentary system.

ment policy both within and without the area of their assigned responsibilities and, in their proper sphere, to exercise supremacy over the civil power has created a divided responsibility between the military and civil authorities in the Japanese Government. The effect of this division on the determination of

policy will be made the subject of a full exposition later in the case.

Mr. President, it has been my task to paint with a broad brush an explanatory picture of the existing governmental structure of Japan resting as it does upon the Constitution itself and upon the basic laws and ordinances supplementary thereto.

The Tribunal will now be informed more specifically by my colleague, Mr. Horwitz, as to the areas of division, gap and overlap in the Japanese constitutional system and as to the functions of these bodies and offices which operating privately and "unseen," fill the gaps and carry out the required liason and whose competence to advise the Throne rests primarily outside the constitution and upon customs and traditions.

At the conclusion of the second part, we will offer in evidence against the defendants, the basic laws and ordinances which have already been marked as Exhibits and upon which our explanation has been based. Thank you.

MR. HORWITZ: Mr. President and Members of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East, in the discussion just completed there has been depicted for the Tribunal, in some detail, the chief

)

organs and the salient features of the Japanese governmental system.

To stop the analysis at this point would be to leave the picture half painted and given an incomplete view of the incidence of responsibility for governmental function and action in the Japanese state.

Particularly we would be likely to fail to grasp the basic responsibility of the accused, or of the great majority of them, for the crimes with which they stand charged in the indictment. In order to fix responsibility for governmental function and action in the Japanese state and in order to fully comprehend the responsibility of the defendants for the crimes charged against them, it is not sufficient to outline the structure of the various constitutional organs and to enalyze their respective functions.

The most cursory examination of the Japanese Constitution and the documents with respect to the several governmental organs established thereunder, as well as the analysis already made, discloses that there exists in the Japanese governmental setup (1) areas of divided jurisdiction, (2) areas of jurisdiction which have not been assigned to

of conflicting and overlapping jurisdiction. To meet
the needs occasioned by these problems, it became
necessary for the Japanese government to make use of
certain extra-constitutional and extra legal bodies
to fill the gaps and to coordinate the activities of
the several organs having jurisdiction over the whole
or part of the same sphere of governmental activity.
It is, therefore, necessary in order to fix governmental responsibility and to obtain some idea of the
governmental mechanism in operation, to ascertain these
areas of division, gap and conflict, and to examine
the extra-constitutional bodies created to meet the
problems engendered thereby.

G 1 2 d 3 e r 4 g 5 & 6

Turning, first, to the Areas of Divided
Responsibility, Conflicts of Jurisdiction, and
Gaps in Jurisdiction and Mechanism, for the purpose
of properly clarifying the issues involved, this
problem will be considered separately with respect
to two of the main functions of government, namely
the legislative and the executive.

Taking, first, the legislative conflicts in the Japanese system, the allocation of legislative powers in the Japanese government is to be found in Articles IV to X inclusive, and Articles XXXVII and LXXIV of the Constitution, Exhibit 68 in the case which provide as follows:

Article IV. The Emperor is the head of the Empire, combining in himself the rights of sovereignty, and exercises them, according to the provisions of the present Constitution.

Article V. The Emperor exercises the legislative power with the consent of the Imperial Diet.

Article VI. The Emperor gives sanction to laws and orders them to be promulgated and executed.

Article VII. The Emperor convokes the Imperial Diet, opens, closes and prorogues it,

e 7 d 8 e n 9

Y

13

10

11

12

16

15

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

and dissolves the House of Representatives.

Article VIII. The Emperor, in consequence of an urgent necessity to maintain public safety, or to avert public calamities, issues, when the Imperial Diet is not sitting, Imperial Ordinances in the place of law.

Such Imperial Ordinances are to be laid before the Imperial Diet at its next session, and when the Diet does not approve the said Ordinances, the Government shall declare them to be invalid for the future.

Article IX. The Emperor issues or causes to be issued, the Ordinances necessary for the carrying out of the laws, or for the maintenance of the public peace and order, and for the promotion of the welfare of the subjects. But no Ordinance shall in any way alter any of the existing laws.

Article X. The Emperor determies the organization of the different branches of the administration, and salaries of all civil and military officers, and appoints and dismisses the same. Exceptions especially provided for in the present Constitution or other laws shall be in accordance with the respective provisions.

Article XXXVII. Every law requires the consent of the Imperial Diet.

Article LXXIV. No modification of the Imperial House Law shall be required to be submitted to the deliberation of the Imperial Diet.

From these provisions of the Constitution, the following general ideas may be deduced with respect to legislative responsibility and division of function.

First, the legislative power is vested in the Emperor subject to the assent of the Diet with respect to the enactment of laws.

Second, when the Diet is not in session, the Emperor, or rather his ministers as his advisors, may exercise the legislative power by Imperial Ordinance. If these Ordinances are later disapproved of by the Diet, they are invalid for the future. However, the Ordinances and all actions taken thereunder are completely valid for the period between their promulgation and the date of disapproval by the Diet. Such legislation may and does alter existing law.

Third, the Diet has no relation whatsoever to the Imperial Household Law. By the Constitution, Imperial Household affairs are placed beyond the

reach of the Diet, and a separation is drawn between the affairs of the Court and those of the State. However, within the prerogatives over the Imperial Household are included matters which are not strictly internal matters of the Court but of vital concern to the people and to the state as well, such as those relating to the succession to the Throne, the institution of a regency and to the Imperial Household Law.

With respect to these matters which belong to the general affairs of state, the cabinet may be consulted, but the Diet has no means of questioning responsibility for the cabinet's advice. The Ministers of State have always refused to answer interpellations in the Diet on Imperial Household affairs, maintaining they have no responsibility to the Diet for such matters.

Fourth, even as to matters within the competence of the Diet, the exercise of its functions are limited by the controls set up for its regulation wherein the power to open, close and prorogue both houses of the Diet, or to dissolve the House of Representatives is vested in the Emperor or in other organs delegated by him.

Fifth, as distinguished from the Imperial Ordinance power which is reserved to the Imperial

Throne by Articles IX and X of the Constitution, the Diet is excluded from participation in many matters which are strictly within the legislative sphere in all modern governmental setups. Thus the Imperial Ministers as agents for the Emperor alone may establish the entire administrative hierarchy, and it is significant to note that the documents which are already produced in evidence establishing the various organs and departments of government are without exception Imperial Ordinances and Rescripts and not enactments of the Diet. With respect to the Ordinance power reserved to the Emperor under Article IX, with the exception of "ordinances necessary for the carrying out of the laws", which may be termed administrative, the remaining power, namely that of issuing ordinances for the maintanance of the public peace and order and for the promotion of the welfare of the subjects, involves matters which are purely legislative in content and are customarily left to the legislature for enactment into law. However, under the Japanese system they are retained in the hands of the Emperor and exercised by the Ministers. Sixth, in addition to the limitations

mentioned before the Diet is precluded from any

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

participation with respect to certain other matters customarily considered part of the legislative function. The organization of the army and navy is determined by the Emperor (Article XII of the Constitution). The Emperor declares war, makes peace and concludes treaties (Article XIII). In these functions neither house of the Diet plays any direct role.

While the legislative power in all its ramifications is vested in the Emperor, he, or rather his Ministers, exercises this power not directly but through delegation to other organs of the government. It is therefore necessary to examine the legislative power of these organs with respect to each other and to the Diet.

I turn now to the Area of Conflict between the Cabinet and the Diet.

Before we can adequately assess the legislative function of the Diet, we must first look at the position of the Cabinet in the Japanese Constitutional system.

Although the Cabinet is the chief executive organ of the government, there is no specific
reference to the Cabinet in the Constitution. If
included at all, it is only by implication. The only

participation with respect to certain other matters customarily considered part of the legislative function. The organization of the army and navy is determined by the Emperor (Article XII of the Constitution). The Emperor declares war, makes peace and concludes treaties (Article XIII). In these functions neither house of the Diet plays any direct role.

While the legislative power in all its ramifications is vested in the Emperor, he, or rather his Ministers, exercises this power not directly but through delegation to other organs of the government. It is therefore necessary to examine the legislative power of these organs with respect to each other and to the Diet.

I turn now to the Area of Conflict between the Cabinet and the Diet.

Before we can adequately assess the legislative function of the Diet, we must first look at the position of the Cabinet in the Japanese Constitutional system.

Although the Cabinet is the chief executive organ of the government, there is no specific
reference to the Cabinet in the Constitution. If
included at all, it is only by implication. The only

Article which may be said to have application to that body is Article LV which provides:

"The respective Ministers of State
shall give their advice to the Emperor,
and be responsible for it. All laws,
Imperial Ordinances and Imperial Rescripts of whatever kind, that relate
to the affairs of the State, require the
counter-signature of a Minister of State."
Yet notwithstanding these facts, the Cabinet

exists as a collective body composed of departmental ministers under the presidency of a minister president for the purpose of initiating, directing and carrying out the general policies of the government and to serve as a channel through which the Imperial prerogative over general affairs is placed in operation. This body owes its origin to the Imperial Rescript on Functions of the Cabinet of December 22, 1885, which is Exhibit 71 in the case, which established a cabinet system, and its composition powers, duties and functions are set forth in that instrument and in the Imperial Ordinance Relating to General Rules Concerning the Organization of the Ministries of 1893, which is Exhibit 73 in the case, and not in the Constitution itself. Article I of the Imperial

Rescript on the Functions of the Cabinet provides:
"The Cabinet is composed of the various Ministers
of State."

According to Article LV of the Constitution, the Cabinet Ministers, or Ministers of State, are responsible for the advice which they give to the Emperor. The Constitution, however, as Prince ITO in his Commentaries explains, is silent about the person or persons to whom they are responsible and for what they are responsible, and the nature of the responsibility.

As to the person to whom there is responsibility, there is unamimity among the constitutional jurists that in legal principle, the ministers of state are primarily directly responsible to the Emperor and that no other organ of the State may question their legal responsibility or remove them from office.

Although the responsibility of the Cabinet is thus agreed to be due primarily to the Emperor, the Diet does have certain legal powers of control over the Cabinet. By means of parliamentary interpellations or asking questions, the passage of resolutions, the presentation of resolutions to the Throne (Article XLIX), the voting approval of emer-

gency Imperial Ordinances (Article VIII) and by its budgetary power (Article LXIV and LXV) the Diet is able to have some measure of control over the Cabinet.

On occasion, the Cabinet has adopted the parliamentary device of resigning or dissolving the House and having the matter decided by the elect-orate upon a resolution of lack of confidence being voted in the Lower House.

As to matters for which the Cabinet is responsible:

Since, under the Japanese Constitution, the Emperor is inviolable and has no responsibility for his acts, and since he exercises his prerogatives only upon the responsible advice of organs of the State, and since it is only upon the advice of a minister of state that the Imperial prerogative over general affairs of state may be exercised, the scope of ministerial responsibility is as broad as the Imperial prerogative over state affairs. This primary responsibility to the Emperor is inescapable as to matters of state, even though the Emperor has sought out the advice of other constitutional and extra-constitutional bodies.

whether cabinet responsibility is an individual responsibility or a collective one, the majority of experts have tended to regard the responsibility as that of the individual minister of state. In practice, the Cabinet has actually assumed collective responsibility under the leadership of the Premier.

The Cabinet as the chief administrative ogran with respect to general affairs of state has wide legislative powers, a portion of which is exer-

cised in conjunction with other governmental bodies. 1 Under the provisions of Article LV of the Constitution, the Cabinet exercises the legislative powers of the Emperor under Articles V, VII, VIII, IX, and X of

Taking up first, the legislative powers exercised by the Cabinet together with the Diet.

Article XXXVIII of the Constitution provides that "Both houses shall vote upon projects of law submitted to it by the Government, and may respectively initiate projects of law." The Imperial Rescript on the Functions of the Cabinet of December 22, 1885, contains the following provisions with respect to the legislative function of the Cabinet.

"Article IV. All laws and all Imperial Ordinances affecting the administration as a whole, shall bear the countersignature of the Minister President as well as that of the Minister from whose Department they directly emanate. All Imperial Ordinances affecting a Special Department only shall be countersigned by the Minister of the Department alone."

"Article V. The following matters shall be submitted for deliberation by the Cabinet.

1. Draft of laws, financial estimates,

2

4 5

that instrument.

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

and settled accounts.

- Treaties with foreign countries and all national questions of importance.
- 3. Ordinances relating to Administration, or to the carrying out of regulations and laws."

It is clear from an examination of the foregoing provisions that the Cabinet exercises the legislative power conferred upon the Diet together with the Diet in one of the following manners:

- 1. Through initiation of legislation.

 Since the elimination of political parties, initiation by the Cabinet has been the sole method used for the introduction of legislation.
- 2. Through the exercise of the power to approve or disapprove legislation introduced by a member of the Diet.

In addition the Cabinet exercises control over the legislative power of the Diet by the provisions of the Constitution wherein the Diet is denied the power to convene of its own accord and wherein the Diet may be prorogued, or in the case of the House of Representatives, dissolved by the Cabinet.

3. The Cabinet, however, exercises power either by itself or in conjunction with governmental organs other than the Diet.

When the Diet is not in session, the
Cabinet exercises the legislative power through the
issuance of Imperial Ordinances as provided in Article
VIII of the Constitution. This power is an extensive
one and is shared in part with the Privy Council. As
the Diet session ordinarily does not exceed three
months in length, as provided in the Constitution,
Article XLII, the Cabinet exercises the legislative
power without Diet concurrence for the greater part
of the year. Although the Diet has the power of disapproval of Imperial Ordinances, the power has been
rarely exercised, and even if exercised can be
obviated by the reissuances of the disapproved ordinance
immediately after the adjournment of the Diet.

In addition the Cabinet has legislative powers over and above those of the Diet in the treaty-making power, which is in no way shared with the Diet, and through the general ordinance power.

One other phase of power which is shared by Cabinet and the Diet is the financial power.

The Constitution contains the following provisions with respect to governmental finances:

"Article LXII. The imposition of a new tax or the modification of the rates (of an existing

one) shall be determined by law.

However, all such administrative fees or other revenue having the nature of compensation shall not fall within the category of the above clause.

The raising of national loans and the contracting of other liabilities to the charge of the National Treasury, except those that are provided in the Budget, shall require the consent of the Imperial Diet."

"Article LXIV: The expenditure and revenue of the State require the consent of the Imperial Diet by means of an annual Budget.

Any and all expenditures overpassing the appropriations set forth in the Titles and Paragraphs of the Budget, or that are not provided for in the Budget, shall subsequently require the approbation of the Imperial Diet."

"Article LXV. The Budget shall be first laid before the House of Representatives."

"Article LXVI. The expenditures of the Imperial House shall be defrayed every year out of the National Treasury, according to the present fixed amount for the same, and shall not require the consent thereto of the Imperial Diet, except in case of an increase thereof is found necessary."

"Article LXVII. Those already fixed expenditures based by the Constitution upon the powers appertaining to the Emperor, and such expenditures as may have arisen by the effect of law, or that appertain to the legal obligations of the government, shall be neither rejected nor reduced by the Imperial Diet, without the concurrance of the government."

"Article LXVIII. In order to meet special requirements, the Government may ask the consent of the Imperial Diet to a certain amount as a Continuing Expenditure Fund, for a previously fixed number of years."

"Article LXIX. In order to supply deficiencies, which are unavoidable, in the Budget, and to meet requirements unprovided for in the same, a Reserve Fund shall be provided in the Budget."

"Article LXX. When the Imperial Diet cannot be convoked owing to the external or internal
condition of the country, in case of urgent need
for the maintenance of public safety, the government make take all necessary financial measures
by means of an Imperial Ordinance."

"In the case mentioned in the preceding clause, the matter shall be submitted to the Imperial

Diet at its next session, and its approbation shall be obtained thereto."

"Article LXXI. When the Imperial Diet has not voted on the Budget, or when the Budget has not been brought into actual existence, the Government shall carry out the Budget of the preceding year."

"Article LXXII. The final account of the expenditures and revenue of the State shall be verified and confirmed by the Board of Audit, and it shall be submitted by the Government, to the Imperial Diet, together with the report of verification of said Board."

An examination of the foregoing provisions discloses that while generally the Diet has logis-lative power with respect to finances, that of the Cabinet is much broader. The following important conclusions can be drawn:

First, the Diet, except in the case of an increase, cannot touch the funds allotted to the Imperial household.

Second, the Cabinet can prevent the Diet from reducing or rejecting any of the following items:

- (i) Expenditures based by the Constitution upon the powers appertaining to the Emperor.
- (ii) Expenditures which have erisen by the effect of law such as treaty obligations.
- (iii) Expenditures that appertain to the legal obligations of the Government.

Third, the Cabinet has wide financial powers not subject to prohibitory control of the Diet in the following instances:

- (i) The use of a Continuing Expenditure Fund which may be set up by a friendly Diet for use in adverse times.
 - (ii) A reserve fund which the Diet must

mondatorily provide.

(iii) The right to make expenditures in excess of the Budget subject to the subsequent approbation of the Diet, which is of little value after an expenditure has been made.

- (iv) The right to issue an Imperial ordinance for all finencial measures in the event the Diet is not in session and cannot be convoked subject only to subsequent approval by the Diet which is of little value in the case of a fait accompli.
- (v) The right to always use the Budget and appropriations of the previous year regardless of the decision of the Diet.

Cabinet and the Privy Council, the Privy Council shares with the Cabinet a vast part of the legislative power. On the one hand it has, in conjunction with the Cabinet the powers exercisable when the Diet is not in session, including the approval of Imperial Ordinances under Articles VIII and LXX of the Constitution; and on the other hand exercises the legislative powers, exercisable irrespective of the sitting of the Diet, including international treaties and agreements, declarations of martial law, and Imperial Ordinances having penal

provisions. In addition, every project of law or bill introduced into the Diet by the Cabinet is previously submitted to the Privy Council for its approval.

"hile the Council has no power to initiate legislation, it has a wide veto and amending power. On bills which have been introduced by a Diet member and have passed the Diet, it can only recommend approval or disapproval in toto. On the other hand, with respect to projects of law submitted to it by the Cabinet before introduction in the Diet, it may not only veto but freely exercise its amending power.

Since the members of the Cabinet are all ex-officio members of the Privy Council, the realm of disagreement between the two bodies, as a matter of fact and a matter of practice in the period covered by the indictment, has been small.

Turning new to the executive gaps and conflicts:

like the legislative branch of the government, the executive department of the Japanese government is not a single agency. Basically, all executive power is vested in the Emperor. It is exercised, in fact, by the Cabinet and its agencies,

1 2

3 4

5

1

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

13

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

the composite of the military and naval agencies known as the "Supreme Command" and the Privy Council. Conflicts of jurisdiction exist within and between these bodies.

First, as to the area of conflict within the Cabinet:

While the Cabinet exercises the chief governmental functions of formulating general policy, determining the modes of the exercise of the authority vested in the Throne formulating the legislative program and by leading the Diet, its effectiveness as the chief governing organ of Japan is severely limited by its dual nature. This "duality" of the Cabinet is due to two factors: (1) the peculiar position held by the ministers of war and navy within the Cabinet; and (2) the nature of the personnel holding the offices of the ministries of war and navy.

The ministers of war and navy possess the important right of jaku joso or the right of direct access to the Throne. In this respect it should be noted that all Cabinet Ministers have the right of access to the Throne. However, the right of the war and navy ministers to approach the Throne is greater than that of other ministers and is coequal with that of the Prime Minister. While the other ministers of

state are responsible in every way to the cabinet for the carrying out of their duties and for advice given to the Throne, the Cabinet does not have such complete control over the war and navy ministers since they have the right of access to the Throne on matters which are kept secret from the other members of the Cabinet except the Premier. This superior right is recognized in Article VII of the Imperial Ordinance on The Functions of the Cabinet which provides:

"Such matters as concern military secrets and military orders and are reported to the Emperor, unless referred to the Cabinet by the Emperor, shall be reported to the Prime Minister by the Minister of War and the Minister of the Navy."

tensified by the fact that the Premier is limited by law in the choice of qualified personnel in the filling of these positions. By Imperial Ordinance 193 of May 9, 1900, the war minister must be a general or lieutenant general and the navy minister must be an admiral or vice-admiral in active service. On June 13, 1913, Admiral Yamamoto succeeded in widening the qualification to include those on the reserve lists, but since the administration of Premier Hirota in

1936 the qualifications have been limited to those in active service. Because of the requirement of active service, the army and navy have control of the appointment of the respective persons to the war and navy ministries. This power is exercised for the army by a triumvirate consisting of the outgoing Secretary of War, the Chief of the General Staff and the Director General of Military Education; and for the navy by a similar group holding the correlative offices in that branch of the service.

The results of this duality of organization have been as follows:

First, by failing to appoint a war minister or a navy minister, either the army or navy could prevent the formation of a cabinet or control the naming of the personnel thereof.

Second, by compelling the war or navy ministers, subject to the orders of the high command because of their active service status, to resign, either the army or the navy could bring about the resignation of the Cabinet.

Third, through the use of the right of direct access to the Throne, the war and navy ministers have been able to obtain the establishment of policy which is contrary to the opinions of the Premier and the other members of his cabinet or which is kept entirely secret from them.

This area of conflict between the military members of the cabinet and the other members of that body is but one phase of the divided and overlapping authority between the cabinet and the high command. According to the Constitution the Emperor has the following powers with respect to the armed services:

Article XI. The Emperor has the supreme command of the Army and Navy.

Article XII. The Emperor determines the organization and peace standing of the Army.

Based on these two articles the Imperial prerogative over military affairs has in practice been divided into the prerogative over the supreme command and the prerogative over the administration of the armed forces.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: By leave of the Tribunal, on behalf of the defendants we wish to object to the continuance of this opening statement, if it is such. Not only is it repetitious of what has gone before but we submit to the Tribunal that counsel is, in fact, testifying. He is placing interpretations upon events and documents. He makes no statement that they intend to prove such things and, in fact, I think we

Q

1,2

can readily see it might be very difficult to prove some of these interpretations.

we, therefore, wish to submit that even without reference to the provisions of the Charter and the rules for a concise opening statement that such a statement as this is highly improper in its attempt to detail all of the evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal desires you to continue, Mr. Horwitz.

MR. HORWITZ: Based on these two articles the Imperial prerogative over military affairs has in practice been divided into the prerogative over the supreme command and the prerogative over the administration of the armed forces. The former covers the power of using the armed forces for the protection of the state from attack from both without and within, and other powers directly relating to military operations. The latter includes the organization of divisions and of fleets, and all matters relating to military districts end sub-districts, to the storing up and distribution of arms, to education, inspections, discipline, modes of salute, uniforms, guards, fortifications, naval defenses, preparation for expeditions and fixing the annual number of recruits. This division has been constantly maintained since

20 21 22

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

23 24

the cabinet system was started in 1885. In the exercise of the former power, that of the supreme command, the Emperor does not exercise it through the cabinet but through the minister of war, the minister of the navy, the chiefs of the general staff and the chief aide-de-camp to the Emperor, all of whom have direct access to the Emperor and who are directly responsible to him. The Emperor is thus assisted in the exercise of the prerogative of the Supreme Command by organs which are separate from, and independent of, those which advise the Throne over general affairs of state.

Abram & Mors

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In practice, the line of demarkation between matters of general affairs of state and supreme command has not been clear. It will be shown time and time again throughout the course of these proceedings that, entrusted with the defense of the nation, the supreme command has challenged the power of the cabinet over many matters on the ground that they were matters of national defense. They have thus claimed and exercised the right to advise the Emperor and to formulate policy on matters relating to the declaration of war, foreign relations, treaty negotiation and ratification and many internal matters because of their relation, actual or supposed, to the subject of national defense. In fact, in the field of foreign relations the Supreme Command has authority to play an independent role. example, Article 10 of the Imperial Ordinance relating to the organization of the Naval General Staff Office, which is exhibit 79 in the case, specifically provides:

"There shall be instituted, at the Japanese Embassies and Legations abroad, Combatant Officers as Embassy and Legation Naval Attaches and Assistant Naval Attaches, and the Chief shall control them."

There exists as a result of this separation of the supreme command from the other organs of government, a sphere of divided responsibility and overlapping function with respect to the major governmental

powers in the Japanese Constitutional System.

In addition to the conflicts pointed out, there are gaps in the constitutional executive setup. One is the administration of the Imperial Household. Since, as pointed out before, the Diet is precluded from passing on questions relating to the Imperial Household and since the Ministers of State, even though they may be and are consulted with respect to matters of the Household, have no responsibility for such matters, and since no other constitutional provision is applicable to the governance of the Imperial Household, a gap exists which has been filled by the creation of extra-constitutional offices and bodies. Likewise a similar situation has exisited with respect to the organization of which is known as the Supreme Command.

Turning now to the Extra-Constitutional
Organs and Offices which have been set up, first of
all of these there is the Chiefs of Staff. This
matter has been fully explored by Brigadier Nolan
and need not be extended here.

Turning now to the Boards.

In addition to the primary offices of the Chief of Staff, there are several military boards which play a part in the exercise of the supreme

1 | command.

First there is the Board of Field Marshals and Fleet Admirals or Gensuifu.

This Board was originally created in 1898, and its membership is limited to field marshals and fleet admirals. Theoretically this body is supposed to be the highest advisory body to the Throne on army and navy matters but it is in fact purely an honorary body with little or no power.

Second, there is the Supreme War Council or Gunji Sangiin.

This Council was created by Imperial Ordinance No. 294 of 1903. Its membership consists of the members of the Board of Field Marshals and Fleet Admirals, the Minister of War and Navy, the Chiefs of the Army and Navy General Staffs and other generals and admirals nominated by the Emperor.

Its function is to advise on all military and naval policy generally and to coordinate all administrative and tactical organizations. It plays no part with respect to tactics and strategy.

It is organized into two divisions - the Army Councillor's Conference and the Navy Councillor's Conference.

Third, the Imperial General Headquarters or Daihonei.

This organization exists only at the time of war or at the time of an incident resembling war. For present purposes it was set up on November 20, 1937, and existed throughout the remainder of the period. It is headed by the Emperor, and its members consisted of the two chiefs of staff, the vice chiefs of staff, and the heads of all staff bureaus, the ministers of war and navy, the vice ministers and certain bureau chiefs from these ministries, the inspector-generals of military training and the Inspector-General of Army operation.

. This organization was divided into two sections - the army section and the navy section - and met both separately in sections and jointly.

Its function is best described in the Ordinance of Daihonei, which is exhibit 80 in the case, (Imperial General Headquarters) as follows:

"....to take part in the highest momentous affairs, to make plan of operations and considering last object, to arrange the cooperation and the
united action of Army and Navy."

Third, we have the Chief Aide-de-camp to the Emperor.

While this officer, a full general, has no connection with the Supreme Command, he has full access to it. All military memorials and requests for audiences with the Throne are submitted through him and all Imperial orders for the army and navy are transmitted by him.

The second group of offices which have been set up to fill gaps or coordinate overlapping functions are the Imperial Household Offices.

The offices set up for the administration of the Imperial Court are divided into two categories: the Outer Court and the Inner Court.

 The Outer Court - The Minister of the Imperial Household (Kunai Daijin).

This office was established by the same ordinance under which the Cabinet was created and this official has the power of administering the household affairs and the properties of the Imperial Household. For the purposes of this trial this office is of no consequence.

Second: The Inner Court.

First there is the Grand Chamberlin (Jijucho).

This official is in a sense the Emperor's adjutant. He is a civil official with no visible

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

connection with the civil government or the supreme command. Appointments for audiences with the Emperor are arranged through his office and he is in charge of all ceremonial matters.

The second office of the Inner Court is the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal (Naidaijin).

Under Article II of the Regulations
for the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, exhibit
95 in this case, the duty of the Lord Keeper is
to assist and advise the Emperor in administering
the affairs of state, constantly attending upon
him. All bills and petitions go through his
office for Imperial sanction. He is the custodian of the Imperial seals and the great state
seals which must be affixed to all documents for
purposes of promulgation.

has been that of recommending to the Emperor a successor premier upon the resignation of a Cabinet.

In prior years, his sole function in this regard was to transmit the decision of the Elder Statesmen or Genro to the Emperor. In 1935, as Prince Saionji grew older, upon resignation of the Hayashi Cabinet, the Lord Keeper himself was asked to and did himself

make the recommendation after consultation with Saionji. This precedent was followed until January, 1940, when the Lord Keeper first determined upon the successor premier after consultation with the individual ex-premiers and thereafter obtained Saionji's views. Upon the establishment of the Third Konoye Cabinet, the Lord Keeper held a conference with the ex-premiers and president of the Privy Council, they acting as advisors to him, and himself made the recommendation. This latter procedure was used at all times thereafter.

There exists one other body with respect to the governance of the Imperial Household, which is the Imperial Family Council.

The members of this group consist of the male members of the Imperial Family who have reached the age of majority, the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, the President of the Privy Council, the Minister of the Imperial Household, the Minister of State for Justice and the President of the Court of Cassation.

By Article IX of the Imperial House Law this Council and the Privy Council, when the Imperial heir is suffering from an incurable disease

of mind and body, or when any other weighty cause exists, may change the order of succession. It also in the same way participates in the appointment of a regency and may change the order of regency appoint or remove an Imperial Governor for the education and bringing up of a minor Emperor, if none has been appointed by the preceding Emperor. The Council likewise acts on matters of disciplinary punishment of members of the Imperial Family and preservation of their property.

The next group of bodies which have been created are the Extra-legal Bodies. The first of these is the Genro.

Genro was an extra-constitutional and extra-legal institution. This body was more or less informally constituted from among the councillors and leaders of the Meiji Restoration and had no status within the constitution, laws or ordinances. However, there gradually developed the custom that those statesmen who played leading roles in the Restoration of 1868 and in the early period of the Constitutional history of Japan were to be consulted on matters of paramount importance in domestic and foreign matters

including the naming of a new cabinet, war declarations, conclusions of peace and negotiations of treaties and international agreements of importance. For many years one or another from among the Genro occupied the important governmental positions of Prime Minister, President of Privy Council or Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal. Beginning informally, the group began to be recognized as a governmental institution and finally in December 1926, when Prince Saionji was appointed a Genro, the institution was formally recognized by an Imperial Rescript making the appointment.

The group met and functioned on direct order from the Emperor that they should meet and advise on the solution of the question submitted. While they advised on grave matters of state such as the declaration of war, conclusion of peace and matters involving international relations, their most important function was in serving as the medium through which a new cabinet was named, thus filling up one of the major gaps in the Japanese Constitutional system occasioned by the fact that as a matter of legal principle the cabinet is responsible only to the Emperor. Upon the death of Prince Saionji in 1940, the Genro disappeared as an institution.

The second of these groups is the group known as the Elder Statesmen or Jushin.

the Emperor on the matter of the selection of a new cabinet from the Genro to the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, the Lord Keeper instituted the practice of consulting individually with the ex-premiers and the President of the Privy Council. This group of Elder Statesmen came to be known as the Jushin. In July 1940, this body was officially formalized by being convoked and meeting as a group to advise the Lord Keeper on the selection of a new premier. While the conference of ex-premiers has the primary function of advising on the selection of a premier, on occasion it has been summoned to advise the Emperor on matters of state of grave importance.

The last group of bodies, which has been set up to meet these problems, are the bodies known as the Liaison Bodies. The first of these is the Liaison Conference or Renraku Kaigi.

With the intensification of the situation following the cutbreak of the China War in 1937, the need for a device to coordinate the activities of the ministers of state and the high commend in their overlapping spheres of authority became readily apparent.

Several devices were set up to meet this need. First
the "Four Minister" meeting of the premier, wer, navy
and foreign ministers was established. Later the finance
minister was added to this group making a "Five Minister"
Conference. In these meetings the views of the Supreme
Command were transmitted through the war and navy
ministers. However the situation developed in such
a manner that the Chiefs of Staff came to the conclusion that this method of working through the war
and navy ministers was unsatisfactory and the liaison
conference plan was adopted to adjust the difference
between the civil government and the high command.

This group which met more or less regularly, consisted of the premier, foreign minister, war minister, navy minister, home minister, chiefs of staff, vice chiefs of staff and the directors of the military affairs and naval affairs bureaus. In addition at times, the President of the Cabinet Planning Board and the Chief Cabinet Secretary attended.

Insamuch as the personnel of these meetings was, with the exception of the Emperor, practically identical with the personnel of the Conference before the Throne hereafter discussed, and since limits on conferences always preceded Conferences before the Throne, the decisions reached in the limits on conference

1 2

 were of the utmost importance in relation to the decisions of the more formal conference.

The second body is the Saiko Shido Kaigi or Conference for the Supreme Direction of the War.

This body came into existence during the Koiso Cabinet during the war, and was in fact the old liaison conference under a new name.

Third, the Dai honei haigi or the Imperial Headquarters Conference.

When, during the course of the wer, the

Lisison Conference and the Conference for the

Supreme Direction of the War failed to adequately

meet the problems involved, the Premier began attending meetings of Imperial Headquarters but without

participating in strategic or tactical matters.

These meetings were known as Imperial Headquarters

Conferences.

The last of the bodies is the Gozen Kaigi or Conferences before the Throne.

Although no authority can be found in the Constitution, laws or ordinances for the Gozen Kaigi or Conference before the Throne, it has existed as an institution in the Japanese Government for hundreds of years. It has continued to function as the organ for reconciling the conflicts arising from the

division of authority in various spheres. As a body it meets only under the gravest of conditions to determine matters of gravest policy.

The membership of the conference in addition to the Emperor has varied both in size and in the nature of the membership. During 1940 and 1941, when five such conferences were held, the membership consisted of the Premier, the President of the Privy Council, the Navy Minister, the War Minister, the Foreign Minister, the Finance Minister, the President of the Cabinet Planning Board, the Chief and Vice-Chief of the Army General Staff, the Chief and Vice-Chief of the Navy General Staff and the Directors of the Military Affairs Section of the Army and the Naval Affairs Section. Occasionally other cabinet ministers attended.

Such conferences did not meet at regular intervals but only at times of grave national importance. Some meetings were publicized and others have been kept secret. During the year preceding the cutbreak of war on December 7, 1941, the conference met on petition for such meeting from the liaison conference. The interested parties would agree on a subject and plan which was presented to the liaison conference, which would in turn request a Conference

1 2

4 5

before the Throne. Ordinarily, in practice, no formal decision was made at the time of the conference, but the concensus of the conference is made the formal decision of the Cabinet.

This discussion, together with the preceding one and the evidence which has been introduced and will be again recalled by Prigadier Nolan, has been presented for the purpose of explaining the frame-work of the Japanese governmental system, to serve as a guide for assaying the actions of the defendants in the light of the evidence which will be presented. The operation of these offices and bodies will be repeatedly demonstrated throughout the course of these proceedings.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal will now recess until three o'clock.

Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

halen & Duda

S

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The Tribunal is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, with the permission of the Tribunal, I now offer in evidence against all the defendants, exhibits 68 to 99, inclusive, being the basic laws and ordinances, which have already been marked as exhibits in the case.

THE PRESIDENT: The evidence is admitted on terms already stated.

(Whereupon, prosecution's exhibits Nos. 68 to 99, inclusive, were received in evidence.)

BRIGADIER NOLAN: As it will become apparent to the Tribunal, the matters which we have been mentioning during the last two days are in the nature of a recurrent theme which will run through all phases of the case. Most of the matters mentioned may be found in the basic laws and ordinances now in evidence. Any other matters mentioned by counsel presenting this phase will be proved in evidence in other phases of the case as the necessity arises.

MR. HORWITZ: If the Tribunal please, at this time, on behalf of the prosecution, we offer a

series of documents which have to do with establishing the offices and positions held by each of the
defendants in the Government of Japan. Each of these
documents has been served, as required by the rules
of Court, more than twenty-four hours prior to their
presentation to the Court, upon counsel for the
defense.

I first offer prosecution exhibit No. 102, being an Official List of the Imperial Japanese Government Officeholders and the period of their tenure for the period 1931 to 1946, covering the following offices: Cabinet Ministers --

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 102, for identification.)

THE PRESIDENT: The document is admitted.

(Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit

No. 102 was received in evidence.)

MR. HORWITZ: "hile the documents from 123 to 129 will be offered individually against the individual defendants, I wish to make a general statement with respect to all of them so that the same thing will apply to all of them.

I wish to make a correction: That is from 103 to 129.

(Whereupon, the documents above referred to were marked prosecution's exhibits Nos. 103 to 129, inclusive, for identification.)

MR. HORWITZ: Each of these documents is an official Cabinet Secretariat Personnel Record of one of the defendants, and to each of them is attached a certificate from the Chief of the Section of Personnel Affairs of the Cabinet Secretariat certifying that this is an official government document, that he has custody of it, and that it is part of the official archives and files of the Cabinet Secretary.

I offer, first of all, prosecution exhibit No. 103, being the Cabinet Secretariat Personnel Record of ARAKI, Sadao.

THE PRESIDENT: The document is admitted on the terms stated.

("hereupon, prosecution's exhibit No. 103 was received in evidence.)

MR. HORWITZ: There are certain items in this document we wish at this time to call to the particular attention of the Court.

(Reading) "On August 1, 1931, the accused ARAKI was appointed Chief of the General Affairs

4 5

6.

Department of the Inspectorate General of Military
Training and the President of Permanent Examination
Committee for Army Officer Students.

"September 10, 1931, appointed a member of the Committee for the Textbook Investigation.

"On December 13 --

MR. McMANUS: Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, I should like to object at this time to any testimony which appears to me as being offered by the prosecutor now. The document is in evidence, and, therefore, I think it speaks for itself; and this time, I believe, is not the proper time to introduce any evidence concerning the defendant ARAKI.

MR. HORWITZ: If the Tribunal please, I am not giving evidence against the defendant ARAKI at this time, but only reading a document which is already in evidence against the defendant ARAKI: not only against the defendant ARAKI but against all the defendants.

MR. "ARREN: If the Tribunal please, may we have a clarification of this particular document?

Counsel states he is introducing a document against ARAKI. Then he makes the statement to the Court that he intends to read from that document concerning all the accused. "e are not informed as to what he intends to do, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal thinks that 1 2 Mr. Horwitz should be allowed to state the contents 3 of the document. MR. HORWITZ: To clarify the point that 5 counsel raised, we are offering this document against 6 all defendants as a public record. (Reading) "December 13, 1931, relieved 8 of all duty and appointed Minister of War. 9 "January 30, 1932, relieved as a member of 10 the Committee for the Investigation of Textbooks. 11 "October 20, 1933, promoted to General. 12 "January 23, 1934, relieved of main duty, 13 and appointed Supreme "ar Councillor. 14 "April 29, 1934, decorated with the Grand 15 Cordon of the Rising Sun for meritorious services 16 for the 1931-1934 Incident. 17 "December 26, 1935, created Baron for 13 meritorious service. 19 "March 6, 1936, placed on the waiting list. 20 "Warch 10, 1936, placed on the reserve list. 21 "October 15, 1937, appointed Cabinet Coun-22 cillor. 23 "May 26, 1938, appointed Minister of Educa-24 25 tion. "May 27, 1938, relieved as Cabinet

Councillor by his own request. 1 "March 28, 1939, appointed President of 2 the General National Mobilization Committee. 3 "August 30, 1939, relieved of his main 4 duty at his own request. 5 "September 6, 1939, specially granted the 6 privileges of his former post. 7 "December 1, 1939, ordered as Cabinet 8 Councillor. 9 "December 23, 1939, appointed a member 10 of the Committee for Promotion of Military Art, 11 12 which committee was abolished by Imperial Ordinance 13 No. 840, issued 3 September 1941. 14 "August 3, 1940, relieved as Cabinet 15 Councillor at his own request. 16 "November 22, 1941, appointed as a member 17 of the National Physical Investigation Committee. 18 "December 15, 1944, appointed a member of 19 the Committee on Preparation to Establish the Museum 20 of the Greater East-Asia." 21 Our next offer: prosecution exhibit No. 22 104, being the Cabinet Secretariat Personnel Record 23 of Kenji DOHIHARA. 24 (Thereupon, the document above 25 referred to was marked prosecution's

exhibit No. 104, for identification.)

THE PRESIDENT: The document is admitted on the same terms.

("hereupon, prosecution's

exhibit No. 104 was received in evidence.)

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: May it please the Tribunal, I wish to now object against this document being offered in evidence against the defendant HIRANUMA, on the ground that it is irrelevant and immaterial.

THE PRESIDENT: I cannot allow you to continue indefinitely on those lines. These documents are being admitted subject to all just exceptions and objections that may be taken at the proper time. The Court rules that this is not the proper time.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: May it please the Tribunal-THE PRESIDENT: I refuse to hear you further,
unless my colleagues disagree with me.

MR. JUSTICE MANSFIELD: If the Tribunal please, the prosecution at this stage is actually tendering these documents in evidence against all the defendants. They are official government records of the Japanese Government, and they are now being tendered directly in evidence, and these documents

will not be tendered at a later stage.

I thought the Tribunal might possibly be under some misunderstanding, or the prosecution may not have stated that directly. We are now directly tendering them as against all the accused as being official government records.

MR. FURNESS: I would like to inquire from the prosecution whether they allege that these documents were served on the defense -- defendant or his counsel twenty-four hours ago.

My information is that they were served on the Secretariat of the Tribunal and were not served on any of the defense counsel. None of the defense counsel have ever seen these documents, and the rules provide that they shall be served on the accused concerned or his counsel, or to the prosecution, as the case may be. It does not provide that they shall be served on the Secretariat.

MR. HORWITZ: It is my understanding that these documents were served late Monday afternoon or early Tuesday morning at the administrative office of defense counsel.

MR. SMITH: If your Honor please, I have not received a copy of anything that has been offered here today, and I have not yet received half the

documents which were received in evidence at the last session.

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, I have ascertained that the documents in question were presented to the defense section; but, because of lack of personnel, distribution to the counsel has been impossible. That is the reason, sir, that we have not received them, and possibly the reason we have not received these other documents. We are at a loss. We will attempt to work out some method with the prosecution or with the Secretariat, we hope, whereby we may have these things because it does look embarrassing to the Tribunal, and it is embarrassing to us to come in and make these objections when actually they have been served, not on the defendants, but on an administrative officer who probably does not realize the importance that they go out immediately.

I thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: "e will go ahead.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, may I say a

word?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: These particular documents were served on a person, whom we understood to

represent the defendants, last Tuesday. Other documents are in the process of being prepared to be served on the defense counsel between now and next Monday in view of the proceedings that are expected to be held on next Monday.

"e are proceeding upon the assumption that delivering them to an office of defense counsel is sufficient. As a matter of fact, it would be practically impossible for us to find the various offices of the various defense counsel and make separate delivery.

we would like to have the Court instruct us as to the method to be followed.

THE PRESIDENT: I am assured by Lord

Patrick that the practice at Nuernberg is the same
as that followed here.

MR. WILLIAMS: May we then be reassured if we do follow the practice we have heretofore followed of having all exhibits for service on the defense delivered at one spot--

THE PRESIDENT: Well, that practice is followed in Germany, and it should be good enough for us unless the contrary is shown.

I have been using the expression "document accepted" or "received" on the same terms. I mean

received for its probative value, saving all just exceptions. I hope I need not have to repeat that every time.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: May it please your Honor, this being so late in the afternoon, may we have an opportunity to inspect these documents?

I applied on June 3, in compliance with Rule 2a of the Rules of Procedure of this Tribunal, to be allowed copies of all documents referred to in the Indictment so far as they were made available by the chief prosecutor; and as to those that were not made available, I requested an opportunity to inspect such copies. I applied on June 3 to the Secretariat in compliance with this rule.

THE PRESIDENT: You will have the opportunity after 4:00 p.m.

57,70

1		MR.	HORWITZ: With respect to Exhibit 104,					
2	I wish t	o call	l particular attention of the Court to					
3	the following entry:							
4	1928 Mar	17	Reported to his Majecty for the Sanction					
5			of the Permission to accept an appoint-					
6			ment under the Chinese Government in					
7			accordance with the Imperial Ordinance					
8			No. 367, Article No. 2.					
9			Reported to His Majesty for sanction					
10			to receive salary from the Chinese					
11			Government during his service to that					
12			Government.					
13	Mar	J.O	Permitted to accept the appointment					
14			under the Chinese Government from 20th					
15			March 1928 to 31st December 1929					
16	1929 Mar	15	Cancelled the contract of the appoint-					
17			ment under the Chinese Government					
18	Mar	16	Appointed Commander of the 30th In-					
19			fantry Regiment (War Ministry)					
20	1930 Dec	22	Attached to the Army General Staff					
21	1931 Aug	1	Attached to the Headquarters of the					
22			Kwantung Army.					
23	1932 Apr	11	Promoted to Major General, Infantry;					
24			Appointed Cornander of the 9th In-					
25		3	fantry Brigade.					

	1932	May	16	Raised to the 5th Court Rank, Se-
				nior Grade.
	1933	Oct	16	Attached to the Headquarters of the
				Kwantung Army (War Ministry)
	1934	Feb	7	Decorated with 2nd Order of Merit
				with the Sacred Treasure.
		Apr	29	Decorated with 5th Order of the
				Golden Kite and given a grant of
				500 Yen.
		Apr	29	Deccrated with the Order of Double
				Rays for meritorious service in
				the Incident between 1931 and 1934.
	1936	Mar	7	Promoted to Lieutenant General;
				Attached to the Headquarters of
				the 12th Division (not mentioned
				in the Official Gazette)
		Mar	23	Attached to Headquarters of the 1st
				Division (not mentioned in the Of-
				ficial Gazette)
		Apr	15	Raised to 4th Court Rank, Junior Grade
		1/0 **	7	
		May	7	Ordered as Deputy Conscription Of- ficer under the 1st Division juris-
				diction.
1				CICCION.

1				
2	1937	Mar	1	Relieved of duty with the Head-
3				quarters of the 1st Division;
4				Appointed Commander of the 14th Di-
5				vision; Relieved of duty as Deputy
				Conscription Officer under the 1st
6				Division jurisdiction; Relieved as
7				Commander of the 1st Replacement
8				Division (Not mentioned in the Offi-
9				cial Gazette)
10		Nov	9	Decorated with the 1st Order of
11				Merit of the Sacred Treasure
12	1938	May	2	Raised to 4th Court Rank, Senior
13				Grade.
14		Jun	18	Attached to the General Staff Head-
15				quarters
16	1939	May	19	Appointed Commander of the 5th Army.
17		May	19	Relieved of duty with the General
18				Staff Headquarters
19	1940	Apr	18	Decorated with the Grand Cordon of
20				the Rising Sun
21		Sop	28	Appointed Supreme War Councilor
22	1941	Apr	28	Promoted to General
23	1941	May	15	Raised to 3rd Court Rank, Junior
24				Grado
25				

1		Jun	9.	Appointed Chief of the Air Inspec-
2				torate General and at the same time
3				a Supreme War Councilor
4	1943	May	1	Appointed Commander of the Eastern
5				District Army; also duty as a Su-
6				preme War Councilor (Not mentioned
7				in Official Gazette)
8		Sop	8	Appointed Chief of the Extraordi-
9				nary Festival Committee of Yasukuni
0				Shrine held on Oct 1943
1	1940	Apr	29	Decorated with the 2nd Class of the
2				Golden Kite for meritorious service
3				in the Chinese Incident
4	1944	Mar	22	Appointed Commander of the 7th Area
5				Army (not mentioned in the Official
6				Gazette)
7		Jun	15	Raised to 3rd Court Rank, Senior
8				Grade (not mentioned in the Offi-
9				cial Gazette)
0	1945	Apr	7	Appointed Chief of the Inspector-
1				ate General of Military Training
2				and also the Supreme War Councilor
3				(Not mentioned in the Official Ga-
1				zette)
		**		

Aug 2	25 Appointed Commander of the 12th
100 30 3	Area Army (Not mentioned in the
	Official Gazette); also Commander
100000000000000000000000000000000000000	
Interview of	of the Eastern District Army (Not
Aug 2	mentioned in the Official Gazette)
	(Not mentioned in the Official Ga-
	zette)
1945 Sep 14	Appointed Commander of the 1st Army
	General Headquarters; Also Commander
	of the 12th Area Army and the Com-
	mander of the Eastern District Army
	and Supreme War Councilor (Not men-
	tioned in the Official Gazette)
Sep 23	
	next offer in evidence prosecutors ex-
	being the Cabinet Secretariat Personnel ASHIMOTO, Kingoro.
modela of in	
	(Whereupon, prosecutor's exhibit
	o. 105 was received in evidence)
Th	ne following entry I wish to call to
the particul	ar attention of the Court:
Jan. 30 1930	Attached to the General Staff Of-
	fice Department.
July 3 1930	

1	3360 ago 39	Staff Office.
2	1929 Jun 29	Leconated with the 4th Class Order
3		of the Sacred Treasure
4	1930 Jan 30	Attached to General Staff Office.
5	1930 Jul 3	Appointed Department Member of the
6	schills Wa. 1	General Staff Office
7	1930 Nov 27	Given additional duty of Military
8		Science Instructor at the Army War
9		College
10	1931 Dec 12	Attached to the 10th Field Artil-
11		lery Regiment
12	1933 Aug 1	Attached to the 2nd Heavy Field
13		Artillery Regiment
14	1934 Aug 1	Appointed Colonel of Artillery and
15		Commander of the Second Heavy Field
16		Artillery Regiment
17	1934 Apr 29	Decorated with the Middle Cordon
18		of the Rising Sun in recognition
19		of services during the disturb-
20		ances from the year 1931 to 1934.
21	1936 Aug 1	Placed on the waiting list.
22	1936 Aug 29	Placed on the reserve list.
23	1939 Mar 9	Relieved as Commander of the 13th
24		Heavy Field Artillery Regiment;
25	The take a li	Attached to Headquarters of the 12th Depot Division

1940 Apr 29	Decorated with the 4th Class Order
	of the Golden Kite in recognition
	of services in the China Disturb-
	ances
New New Ar	next offer in evidence prosecution's
exhibit No.	106, being the Cabinet Secretariat
Personnel Rec	cord of HATA, Shunroku.
THE	PRESIDENT: The document is admit-
ted on the sa	ame terms.
	(Whereupon, prosecutor's exhibit
No.	. 106 was received in evidence,)
MR.	HORWITZ: I call the particular at-
tention of th	ne Court to the following items in
this document	and the interest or since the
1931 Aug .1	Appointed Lieutenant General and
	appointed as an inspector of Ar-
	tillery. Released from his former
	post and appointed Commander of the
	14th Division.
1934 Apr 29	Decorated with the first order
	of merit with the Grand Cordon of
	the Rising Sun in recognition of
	meritorious services rendered in
	the Incident of 1931-1934.
1935 Dec 2	Appointed Chief of Army Force Head-
	exhibit No. : Personnel Recommendation of the second that the document 1931 Aug .1

1	1000 200 00	quarters
2	1936 Jan 16	Appointed as a member of the Na-
3		tional Advisory Committee for Aero-
4	, 1939 Ans 30	nautics
5	1936 Aug 1	Released from his regular post and
6		appointed Commander of the Formosan
7	1940 Any 59	Army
8	1936 Oct 14	Released from the post of a member
9		of National Advisory Committee for
10		Aeronautics
11	1937 Aug 2	Released from the above post and
12		appointed Military Councilor
13	1937 Aug 26	Relieved of his present post and
14	1941 Hen 1	appointed Inspector-General of Mi-
15		litary Education and concurrently
16	1942 300 2	appointed Military Councilor (Ca-
17		binet)
18	1937 Nov 1	Appointed Full General.
19	1937 Dec 13	Appointed Councilor (Gitei-Kan)
20	1938 Feb 14	Released from the regular and the
21		additional posts
22	1938 Feb 14	Appointed Commander of the Expedi-
23		tionary Force to Central China
24	1938 Dec 15	Released from the above post and
25		appointed Military Councilor.

	1939 May 25	Released from the above post
	1939 May 25	Appointed Chief Aide-de-Camp to
,		His Majosty.
1	1939 Aug 30	Appointed War Minister and con-
		currently President of the Manchu-
5		rian Affairs Board
,	1940 Apr 29	Decorated with the 1st Class Order
3		of the Golden Kite (in recognition
		of his meritorious services render-
		ed in the China Affair)
	1940 Jul 22	Released from the regular and ad-
		ditional posts by request and ap-
		pointed Military Councilor.
	1941 Mar 1	Appointed Commander in Chief of
		the Expeditionary Force to China.
	1942 Jun 2	Appointed member of the Board of
		Field Marshals and Admirals and
		awarded specially the title of
		Field Marshal
	1944 Nov 22	Appointed Inspector-General of
		Military Education
	1945 Apr 7	Appointed Commander in Chief of
		the 2nd Army Corps.
	1945 Nov 30	The Institution of Field Marshals
		was also abrogated by the abolition

of the charter of the Board of 1 Field Marshals by the Imperial 2 Ordinance No. 669 3 We wish to call the Court's attention 4 to Exhibit 102, already in evidence, which shows 5 at page 14 thereof that at the time he becamme War 6 Minister on August 30, 1939, the defendant HATA, 7 Shunroku, also became Vice-President of the China 8 9 Affairs Board. I next offer in evidence the prosecutor's 10 exhibit designated No. 107, being the Cabinet Se-11 cretariat Personnel Record of HIRANUMA, Kiichiro. 12 THE PRESIDENT: The document will be ad-13 14 mitted on the usual terms. 15 (Whereupon, prosecutor's exhibit 16 No. 107 was received in evidence.) 17 MR. HORWITZ: We call the particular at-18 tention of the Court to the following items in this 19 document: 20 Appointed Vice-President of the 1926 Apr 12 21 Privy Council. Created a Baron for distinguished 22 1926 Oct 28 23 services. 24 1935 Oct 26 Appointed to the government com-25 mittee of the permanent Arbitration

1		
1		Committee between Japan and Holland.
2	1936 Mar 13	Appointed the Head of the Privy
3		Council.
4	1936 Feb 22	Appointed President of the Kings
5		and Royal Family Investigation Com-
5	*	mittee.
7	1936 Apr 1	Released by his request as a member
8		of the government committee on the
9		Permanent Arbitration Committee
0		between Japan and Holland.
1	1936 Apr 6	Appointed as a Councilor (Gijokan)
2	1939 Jan 5	Appointed Premier, and from docu-
3		ment
4	1939 Aug 30	Released from his principal post.
5	1939 Sept 6	Accorded the treatment due his
5		latest position as a special favor.
7	1940 Dec 6	Appointed as Minister without Port-
8		folio.
)	1940 Dec 21	Appointed as a Home Minister.
0	1941 May 7	Ordered to serve on the Civil Ser-
1		vice Committee.
2	1941 Jul 18	Appointed as the Minister without
3		Portfolio.
4	1941 Oct 18	Released from the principal post
5		at his own request, and especially

1	accorded the treatment of a former
2	Premier.
3	1942 Aug 28 Ordered to be dispatched to China
4	as the Special Envoy of good will.
5	1942 Oct 14 Released from his post on comple-
6	tion of the duty.
7	1945 Apr 9 Appointed Head of the Privy Council.
8	1945 Jun 8 Appointed as a Councilor (Gijokan).
9	1945 Dec 15 Released from his principal post
10	at his request.
11	I next offer in evidence for the prosecu-
12	tion exhibit No. 108, being the Cabinet Secretariat
13	Personnel Record of HIROTA, Koki.
14	THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the same terms.
15	(Thereupon, prosecution exhibit
16	No. 108 was received in evidence).
17	MR. HORWITZ: The following items are
13	called to the attention of the Court:
19	1926 Nov 22 Appointed as an Envoy Extraordinary
20	and Minister Plenipotentiary, and
21	ordered to be stationed in the
22	Netherlands.
23	1929 Aug 7 Appointed to the Imperial Japanese
24	Delegate to the Conference held
25	at the Hague, Netherlands, concern-

-				ing the Reparation Question
-				of Germany.
	1929 1	lug	23	Appointed to the retinue of the Im-
-				perial Japanese Delegate to the
-				10th Assembly of the League of
1				Nations held at Gevena, Switzerland.
-	1930 (Oct	15	Appointed as an Envoy Extraordinary
-	1932 9			and Ambassador Plenipotentiary, pro-
-				moted to the first grade of high
1				official and ordered to be station-
-				ed in U.S.S.R.
-	1932 1	vov	19	Relieved of being stationed in
-				U.S.S.R.
-	1933 8	Sep	14	Appointed to Minister of the For-
-				eign Ministry.
1	1934	Apr	29	Conferred the Grand Cordon of the
-				Imperial Order of the Rising Sun
-				for meritorious services during
1				Showa 6-7 Incident.
-	1935	Sep	21	Got permission from the Imperial
				Household Dept. of the use of the
-				commemoration medal sent by the
				Manchukuo Emperor for his visit
1				to Japan.
1	1936	1/	9	Appointed to Prime Minister and

	concurrently to_Minister of Foreign
	Ministry.
1936 Apr 2	Relieved of the concurrent post
1937 Feb 2	Relieved of the Prime Minister by
	request
1937 Apr 29	Accorded the honorable treatment
	of a Minister of State
1937 May 31	Appointed to a member of the House
	of Peers according to No. 4, Article
	I of the Regulation for the House
	of Peers.
1937 Jun 4	Appointed Minister of the Foreign
	Ministry
1937 Jun 10	Appointed to President of the Plan-
3 84 8 Cot 23	ning Board.
1937 Oct 25	The President of the Planning Board
-,3,	was abrogated by the Imperial Ordi-
	nance No. 605 of the Showa 12th year.
1923 Apr 25	Got permission from the Imperial
1950 Mp1 25	Household Dept. of the use of a de-
	coration of the first order of the
	Ryuko Daijisho sent by the Manchu-
	kuo Emperor
1938 May 29	Relieved of the post of Minister of Foreign Ministry.
	1937 Feb 2 1937 Apr 29 1937 May 31

1	1938	Jun	8	Accorded the honorable treatment
2		9, 3		of a Ministry of State
3	1938	Nov	2	Conferred a silver cup for meri-
4				torious service re Japano-German
5				Anti-Comintern Pact.
6	1940	Mar	13	Appointed to Councilor of the
7				Cabinet.
8	1940	Aug		Relieved of Councilor of the
9				Cabinet
10	1942	Jun	20	Sent to Thailand for returning cour-
11				tesies of commemoration re the Japano-
12				Thailand Alliance (Special Envoy for
13				returning courtesies of commemora-
14				tion re this Alliance)
15	1945	Dec	13	Relieved of the member of the House
16				of Peers by request.
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				processing of temperature.
23				remarks an oping of the Bureau of
24				
25				

•

1	From documents exhibit 102 to pages 35
2	and 36, I call the attention of the Court to the
3	fact that this accused was also a member of the Supreme
4	War Council when Prime Minister and Foreign Minister.
5	We now offer in evidence for the prose-
6	cution exhibit No. 109, being the Cabinet Secretariat
7	and Personnel Record of HOSHINO, Naoki.
8	THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the same terms.
9	(Whereupon prosecution's exhibit No.
10	109 was received in evidence.)
11	MR. HORWITZ: We call the particular attention
12	of the Court to the following items in this document:
13	1932 Jul 17 Appointed as a commissioner in the
14	Finance Ministry of Manchakuc;
15	Promoted to the 2nd class in Manchukuc
16	and appointed as Chief of General
17	Affairs
18	1934 Jul 1 Appointed as Chief of General Affairs
19	in the Finance Ministry of Manchukuo
20	Promoted to the 1st class in Manchukuo
21	1936 Jun 9 Appointed as Vice Chief of the Finance
22	Ministry of Manchukuo
23	1936 Dec 16 Appointed as Chief of the Bureau of
24	General Affairs in the National Affairs
25	Office of Manchukuc

1	1937	Jul	1	Appointed as Chief of General Affairs
2				in Manchoukuo
3	1940	Apr	29	Decorated with the 2nd Order of Merit
4				with the order of the Double Rays of
5				the Rising Sun for meritorious service
6				in China Affair.
7	1940	Jul	21	Relieved of duty.
8	1940	Aug	5	Specially granted the privileges of
9				his former post
10	1940	Jul	22	Appointed as President of Planning
11				Board and appointed as Minister of
12				State without Portfolio by Cabinet
13				Regulations Article 10.
14		Oct	1	Appointed as Acting Director of the
15				Overall War Strength Experimental
16				Station.
17	1940	Oct	16	Awarded the 1st Order of Merit with
18				the order of KEIUN-SHO which was given
19				by the Manchurian Emperor and allowed
20				to wear it; Awarded the 1st Order of
21				Merit with the order of KEIKOKU-SHO
22				which was given by the Manchurian
23				Emperor and allowed to wear it
24		Dec	6	Appointed as a Minister of State and
25				additionally as the President of the
		The same of		

	1	
1		Planning Board
2	Dec 12	Decorated with the 2nd Order of Merit
3		with the Order of the Sacred Treasure
4	1941 Jan 11	Relieved as Acting Director of the
5		Overall War Strength Experimental
6		Station
7	Apr 4	Relieved of the main duties and the
.8		additional post at his request
9	1941 Apr 4	Appointed as a member of the House
10		of Peers according to the rule of
11		the House of Peers
12	May 2	Appointed as a Councillor of the
13		Overall War Strength Experimental
14		Station
15	Jul 12	Appointed as a member of the National
16		Mobilization Investigation Committee
17	Oct 18	Appointed as Chief Secretary of the
18		Cabinet; and specially granted the
19		treatment accorded officials of the
20		Shinnin Rank; and appointed as a mem-
21		ber of the Communication Regulations
22		Commission.
23	Nov 1	Appointed as Councillor of the Planning
24		Board
25	1941 Nov 5	Released as member of the Investigation

	Committee on National Mobilization;
	and appointed as the member of the
	Investigation Committee on National
	Mobilization, being a new committee.
1941 Nov 15	Appointed as a Member of the govern-
	ment committee at the 77th Session of
	the Imperial Diet.
Nov 24	Relieved as Councillor of the Overall
	War Strength Experimental Station.
1941 Dec 15	Appointed as a member of the govern-
	ment committee at the 78th Session of
	the Imperial Diet.
Dec 25	Appointed as a member of the govern-
	ment committee at the 79th Session of
	the Imperial Diet.
1942 Feb 21	Appointed as a Secretary of the In-
	vestigation Committee for the Estab-
	lishment of Greater East Asia.
Apr 21	Appointed as a Councillor of the Board
	of Technology.
May 26	Appointed as a member of the Govern-
	ment Committee at the 80th Session of
	the Imperial Diet.
Nov 1	Appointed as a member of a Liaison

ſ		
1		Committee of the Greater East Asia
2		Ministry.
3	Dec 24	Appointed as a member of the Govern-
4		ment Committee at the 81st Session of
5		the Imperial Diet.
6	1943 June 15	Appointed as a member of the govern-
7		ment committee at the 82nd Session of
8		the Imperial Diet,
9	Oct 25	Appointed as a member of the Govern-
10		ment Committee at the 83rd Session of
11		the Imperial Diet.
12	Dec 24	Appointed as a member of the govern-
13		ment committee at the 84th Session of
14		the Imperial Diet.
15	1944 Jun 30	Appointed as a Councillor of the Mun-
16		itions Ministry.
17	Jul 22	Relieved of the main duty at his re-
18		quest.
19	Dec 29	Appointed as an adviser to the Finance
20		Dept.
21	1945 Mer 8	Appointed as Chief of the Committee
22		for Establishment of the Central
23		Association of Life Insurance.
24	May 7	Appointed as a member of the Special
25		Planning Committee for Capital Absorption.

		We	now offen in evidence for the rescoution
			now offer in evidence for the prosecution
-			10, being the Cabinet Secretariate Person-
neı	neco		ITAGAKI, Seishiro.
		THE	PRESIDENT: Admitted on the same terms.
			(Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit No. 110
		was	received in evidence).
		MR.	HORWITZ: We call attention to the fol-
lowi	ng i	tems:	
1929	May	14	Appointed Staff Officer of Kwantung
			Army.
1932	Aug	8	Appointed Major General and attached to
			the Kwantung Army Headquarters
1934	Aug	1	Attached to the Kwantung Army Head-
			quarters
1934	Dec	10	Concurrently appointed Military Attache
			of the Japanese Embassy in Manchukuo
	Dec	10	Relieved of post, attached to the
			Kwantung Army Headquarters; Appointed
			Vice Chief of Staff of the Kwentung
			Army.
	Apr	29	Decorated with the 3rd Class Order of
		-/	Golden Kite with an annuity of ¥700;
			Decorated with the Order of the Rising
		700	Sun with Double Rays in recognition of
			services of 1931-1934 Incidents

1	1936	Mar	23	Relieved of additional post as Military
2				Attache of the Imperial Embassy in
3				Manchukuo; and
4				Relieved of post as Vice Chief of Staff
5				of the Kwantung Army;
6				Appointed as the Chief of Staff of the
7				Kwantung Army
8		Mar	28	Appointed Japanese member of the Japan-
9				Manchukuo Economic Joint Committee .
10		Apr	28	Appointed Lt. Gen.
11	1937	Mar	1	Assigned as Commander of the 5th Division
12		Mar	6	Relieved of post as Japanese member of
13				Japan-Manchukuo Economic Joint Committee
14		May	25	Attached to Army General Staff Office
15		Jul	7	Decorated with the Grand Cordon of the
16				Rising Sun for services in the 1931-34
17				Incidents
18	1938	Jun	3	Relieved of post, attached to the Army
19				General Staff Office and appointed War
20				Minister and concurrently President of
21				Manchurian Affairs Bureau
22	1939	Aug	30	Relieved of present post and additional
23				posts at his own request
24	1940	Apr	29	Decorated with the 2nd Class Order of
25				the Golden Kite in recognition of the

1	
1	services in China War
2	1941 Jul 7 Appointed General and appointed Com-
3	mander of the Korean Army
4	1945 Feb 1 Appointed Commander of the 17th Military
5	District Army and concurrently Commander
6	of the Korean Military Area Army
7	1945 Apr 7 Appointed Commander of the 7th Military
8	District Army
9	THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn now until
10	thirty minutes after nine on Monday.
11	(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment
12	was taken until 0930, Monday, June 17, 1946.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	